1224

AN

# ANSWER

TO THE

# *PAMPHLET,*

ENTITLED

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST AN UNION, &c. &c.

IN A

# LETTER

ADDRESSED TO

EDWARD COOKE, Esq.

SECRETARY AT WAR.

---

BY

PEMBERTON RUDD, Esq.

BARRISTER AT LAW.

---

—DUBLIN:—

PRINTED FOR J. MILLIKEN, 32, GRAFTON-STREET.

1799.

1798 Dec 10

# A N S W E R

TO THE

# PAMPHLET,

ENTITLED

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST A UNION, &c. &c.

IN A

# L E T T E R

BRITISH MUSEUM

TO

EDWARD [illegible] Esq.

SECRETARY AT WAR.

---

FROM

P. PEMBERTON RUDD, Esq.

BARRISTER AT LAW.

---

—DUBLIN—

PRINTED FOR J. MILLIKEN, 24, DRAPER'S-ITALY.

---

1799.

AN

# ANSWER, &c. &c.

TO

## EDWARD COOKE, Esq. &c. &c.

SIR,

WHEN I address YOU, or ANY man, (to whom I have not the honour to be personally known), my first care is—not to be misunderstood;—my first hope—not to offend.

The question (Union or no Union) is become no novelty to the minds of the Citizens of Dublin, and I should be excuseable, perhaps, in discussing it without preface. Yet, as I make YOUR name the usher of MY sentiments to the public, I hold myself bound to account to you, Sir, why I presume to do so.

I have read a pamphlet, (read it, in MANY places with admiration, and I hope, in ALL with reſpect and temper) I have read a pamphlet, entitled "Arguments for and againſt an Union, between Great Britain and Ireland," and I have heard, (univerſally heard), that you are its author.

OR

If you are NOT the author of the pamphlet in queſtion, I beg you to conſider the few following ſheets, merely as a dedication, (nothing more), to a gentleman, who happens, in theſe times of wars and rumours of wars, to fill a very high and confidential office in the military department of this country, with the affiduity of a man of buſineſs, and the manners of a gentleman. If you ARE the author of that pamphlet, I have no apology to make. I ſhall treat you, as I hope to be treated myſelf; read you with ſeverity and criticiſm; *ſtrive* to anſwer you with candor, ſincerity, and truth. I may diſſent from your deductions as a politician—without outraging your feelings as a gentleman. To you, then, Sir, no more—to the public, eſpecially the Dublin public, who have read your pamphlet——

"AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM."

You set out by saying, and you say truly, that the Union is a question of extent and importance; that it applies warmly to the feelings—I believe indeed you say, "to all the feelings of the human mind;" but, alas! there are some men, who have some feelings, to which argumentative applications were in vain; for, they are "armed so strong in"—(I was going to say "honesty,") "that they pass by them as the idle winds, which they respect not." You say, it is a question cannot fail to be universally debated, but you express your fear "that it will not be PROPERLY debated." I am sorry you should have carried the rules of academic theme-writing into the composition of a political pamphlet; I am sorry you should have elucidated your position, by your personal example! Yet, I confess, you have made a convert of me. I have read your pamphlet, and I agree with you, that the Union is a subject, which MAY not be PROPERLY debated.

But of this—more anon:——

Though I do not completely subscribe to the order, even, in which you have arranged your arguments; yet as I presume to answer you, I hold myself obliged to follow you. I think it my duty

to

to attend you, "*seriatim et literatim*," through every page and line of a production, likely to intereſt ſo deeply every man I value in ſociety. In yourſelf, I believe, you are entitled to all poſſible conſideration and deference to your opinions—but I go farther than that: I believe, and ſo do thouſands as well as I—that you ſpeak the ſentiments, at leaſt, that you hold out the reaſonings of men higher in political conſequence than yourſelf: and that we, poor people at the *outſide* of the curtain, who are too far removed from the machinery of State Pieces, to ſee the wires which conduct the Pantomime; can only gueſs at what paſſes behind the Scenes, from the now-and-then glimpſe of the hand of the Prompter. We *muſt* argue *from* you *to* them: What you would venture to ſay, you or they might hazard to do: it is all one, "QUI FACIT PER ALIUM, FACIT PER SE."

Well then, Sir, You would have a Union? Is it ſo? But you would "diſcuſs it *fairly*," and to prove your ſincerity, you ſay you will begin by ſtating the queſtion in the Abſtract; viz. (Page 2) "Two independent States, finding their ſeparate "exiſtence mutually inconvenient, propoſe to form "themſelves into one State, for their mutual "benefit." I deny your poſtulatum: I never heard

one

one ſingle Engliſhman repine at his ſeparate exiſtence, deprecate his mutual inconveniences, or pray to unite his fate through life, with ſuch a dower-leſs termagant Conſort as poor Ireland. Nay, I am yet to learn, that even the moſt inſignificant *claſe* Borough in *this* kingdom has petitioned either his Majeſty or the Parliament, to adviſe—to promote—or to effect an Union. I look in vain for the documents whence you collect your hypotheſis: The Quarry muſt be a plaguy ſecret one, from which you have hewn this corner-ſtone of your edifice. Yet you ſay, "nothing can be deviſed more fit for ſober and philoſophic argument." I think it looks bad in proſe, yet it might make neat argument to a Canto of Poetry, for it is pretty fiction.

The light of hiſtory is beyond queſtion, ſingularly uſeful in ſhewing us the ſtumbling blocks which tripped up our foreſathers, and pointing to us the way which we ourſelves ſhould go. The Author of the Pamphlet before me, has availed himſelf of every—even the moſt antique illumination on the ſubject, and has ſelected no leſs than TWO examples to prove that an Iriſh Union would be a "good thing." Of theſe two examples, it is true, that one is a few thouſand years poſterior

to

to the other. It is in the Pamphlet however, (page 3.) put first, and so I take it—I mean the example of the Seven United Provinces, which were (to use the Author's own words) "cruelly oppressed by the Spanish government, &c." and so "they separated to escape tyranny," &c." and the Author says "they did right." Now, is this an argument for an Irish Union?

But, no doubt, the strong argument is kept for the last—I have dwelt on it with attention, and it runs in these words: "When the Sabines found they "could not maintain themselves any longer against "the Romans, and saw that by uniting with them "they had an opportunity of encreasing their li- "berty, their happiness, and their power; they acted "according to the principles of reason and right "in relinquishing their separate independency as a "state, *and by their Union, laid the foundation of* "*Roman Greatness*." Apply the parallel. Have the Sabines (i. e. the Irish) *found* that they cannot maintain themselves *any longer* against the Romans, (i. e. the English)? Do the Irish see, that by uniting with them, they have an opportunity of encreasing their liberty, their happiness, and (oh! monstrous!) their power? Will even the Author of the Pamphlet answer these questions in the affirmative?

tive? And if he does, ſtill what becomes of his concluſion, viz. "and by that Union, laid the "foundation of their greatneſs." Of whoſe greatneſs? Of Roman, *Roman* greatneſs. What became even of the very name of Sabine? Was it not loſt, merged, overwhelmed and engulphed in the vortex of Roman Rapacity? The Sabines aggrandized the Romans: admired! Do you want the Iriſh to aggrandize Great Britain? She don't need it—She is, no adjective ſtate: In the political grammar of Europe, England can ſtand alone!!! PROUDLY ALONE! and were it otherwiſe, what Iriſhman, would ſnatch the ſtaff from the hand of Hibernia, ſcarce yet able to ſtand erect, or walk alone; to place it in the graſp of a Sifter, older, richer, greater, and ſtronger; to be hereafter uſed, perhaps, as the inſtrument of unmerited infliction,—at beſt, as the Mace of arrogant ſuperiority. Nay, farther; ſuppoſing every poſſible good conſequence, eventually, to ariſe from it; *My* mind has an inſurmountable antipathy to the old *forcible* reaſons which muſt be the neceſſary forerunners to aſſimilate theſe caſes: I ſhould be grieved even to agony, to find the *ravißing* arguments which overcame the Sabines, applied to my fair, my honoured, my

virtuous country-women: and deeply should I fear, that the produce of such an Union would be deserted, or contaminated, as a bastard, and instead of being cherished with the milk of human kindness, would be stinted in its nourishment and *fledged by a wolf*. If the Author will have Sabine History, why did he forget to hint at the fate of Sabina Tatia? It might be no inapplicable caution to the Irish promoters of an Union. As the Author proceeds to except especially to every arguments drawn from what he calls "the common-place topics of national dignity and national pride"—I forbear to touch on them; indeed on that head, there can not be TWO opinions, and the question with which he begins, (page 4) is a *petitio principii*.

I deny that the consolidation of the separate states of the Heptarchy into one empire, nay, even the junction of the kingdom of Scotland to England, can at this day furnish a just and reasonable parallel to an Union between this Country and Great Britain. Independent of the other realms of popular pre-opinions, (for I will not libel them with the term prejudices) independent of nationality and other arguments to be touched on hereafter,

Nature

Nature herself seems to have interposed local obstacles and impediments to such an undertaking—Nature had not dealt with Scotland as with Ireland—She had not expanded the bosom of the Tweed to the breadth of the Irish Channel, nor dropt the Scottish Hebrides like the verdant plains of Ireland,

"a PRECIOUS ONE! SET IN THE SILVER SEA."

SHAKESPEARE'S RICHARD III.

This Author pretends to make just distinctions between questions of choice and of necessity. I pray Heaven! they never may become distinctions without difference.

An Union is compared, (page 5.) to a partnership. But we should not forget that by the very articles of partnership, an eternal relinquishment of our little capital would be a STIPULATION. Our hopes of benefit from this fine participation in an extensive and actually formed trade might be disappointed, and we might pine in wishes ourselves from this great scale of things, and carry on business in an humbler, happier sphere. But where or how is the once-relinquished capital to be substituted? Alas! the

 Independence

Independence and the Conſtitution we have once parted with, is gone and ſurrendered for ever! And truly ſhould we *never* wiſh to diſſolve the connection, I ſee no mighty comfort or reſpectability attached to the ſituation, at leaſt of the poor co-partner. Muſt he not travel every ſitting to the counting-houſe of his more wealthy ally, who takes care to keep the books and the coffers in his own parlour: and when at laſt the profits of the ferme are to be diſtributed, he receives, not a ſhare, but a ſtipend, and diſcontentedly departs not with the honorable dividend of a partner, but the galling wages of a clerk.

In caſe of an Union, the Author thus lays down the relative circumſtances of each partner, or State: Ireland, "inferior in point of Civilization, Agriculture, Commerce, Manufactures, Morals, Manners, Eſtabliſhments, Conſtitution;" England, "Eminent and Superior in all!" Then, ſays he, is it not evident, "the former muſt be amazingly benefited by an Union?" What! are we to ſuppoſe, or would he infer that England would unconditionally, gratuitouſly, and without moſt weighty correſponding ſacrifices upon our part, be ſo unnaturally

naturally generous, as to *force* these benefits upon us! ——

"TIMEO DANAOS, ET DONA FERENTES."

I would beſeech Iriſhmen to pauſe, before they ruſh into the arms of ſuch deceitful blandiſhment; and beware how they ſurrender a conſtitution, they never can recal!

But if I have hitherto diſſented from the arguments of the pamphlet before me, how ſhall I expreſs my ſurprize and aſtoniſhment, at the language of the 8th and 9th pages, in which the example of France—yes! of lawleſs, graſping, robbing France, is held up as the mirror to nations; and as the alluring example to—what? to *Indiviſibility and Union!* Not to dwell upon the horror with which every honeſt native of England and Ireland, have been forced to look at every political act of that all-graſping and unprincipled people; not to mention the moral turpitude, nor the political infidelity of the principle, ſurely, if this example or parallel of our author proves any thing, it proves too much; for if England (in caſe

caſe of an Union) is to become like overgrown France, Ireland, (to carry on his own parallel), muſt be Geneva, which our author TELLS us is incorporated, and which WE KNOW is enſlaved; or, ſhe muſt be Savoy, which he alſo tells us is incorporated, and which we know has been deluged in blood; or ſhe muſt be Auſtrian Flanders or Spain, the one convulſed with factions and intrigue, the other trembling from her vicinity to plunderers, to whoſe rapacity and avarice, the Pyrenees are Mole-hills; or ſhe muſt be Holland, Switzerland, Sardinia, or the new Republic of Italy—take your choice. Glorious examples all of fraternal Union, and the bleſſings of ſtrict political Indiviſibility! I confeſs I am ſtartled at this whole paſſage; and though I have read it often, I ſhould doubt that I had read it aright, were it not for the very unequivocal ſentences which follow: "France well knows the principle and the force of incorporations." "Every ſtate which ſhe unites to herſelf, ſhe makes part of her empire, ONE and INDIVISIBLE," &c. &c. Indeed I ſhould not have reliſhed this implied approbation of the predatory policy of our enemy, even in a common writer; but when I find it flow from a pen, which we muſt

ſuppoſe

ſuppoſe to have been dipped in the ink, perhaps, of the Privy-council-chamber, and guided by an official hand, I acknowledge my wonder without reſerve. "*France!* ONE and INDIVISIBLE!!!" For God's ſake, if her pernicious ſyſtem muſt be held forth at all, let it be exhibited as a warning to deter, not diſplayed as a model for imitation. We have lately had one kind of Union (as they called it) attempted for Ireland, and, thanks to the Providence of Almighty God, to the valour and true patriotiſm of the Yeomanry of Ireland, and to the prudence, vigilance, and energy of government, that wicked, bloody, and unnatural attempt, recoiled on the heads which planned it; the political blunderbuſs burſt in the hands which dared to preſent it! Again I ſay—let Iriſhmen beware of an Union!

Though the pamphlet before me, and which I am thus preſuming to analyze, be entitled, "Arguments for and againſt an Union," I am able (as yet) to diſcover no arguments, but what are enliſted (ſome of them actually preſſed) into the ſervice of the PRO ſide of this queſtion: unleſs, indeed, we are to conſider ſome of them as being veritably intended (by a very delicate irony

of

of the author) to undermine the very cause to which common and plain-judging apprehensions might think them applied as supporters; and truly of this class might be supposed the argument of page 10, where the author states the loss which the secondary state or province must always and necessarily sustain, from the non-residence of only one branch of the legislative aggregate, namely, the Sovereign; and yet (unpardonably enough, methinks) passes over, nay, purely omits the obvious and palpable inference, *a fortiori*, of how very much these said losses must be extended, multiplied, and aggravated, (in case of such indivisible Union), when not only the king would continue an absentee, but the whole house of peers, (late residents in this kingdom), would *become* absentees, and not only king and peers be absent, but all the whole three branches of the legislature, King, Lords, Commons! ALL Absentees. I have said, the *whole* House of Peers, and I think it will not be difficult to support the supposition; for if you deduct, in the first instance, the number of elective peers, who must necessarily repair to attend parliamentary duties every session, to London (twenty, suppose—if, indeed, England would be so good as

to

to allow us ſo many), if you then deduct the number of other Iriſh peers, who, from Engliſh political intereſts, Engliſh matrimonial connections, and ſundry other cauſes, have been induced, and no doubt would continue to be additionally induced, to accept and ſolicit ſeats in the Engliſh Houſe of Commons, I believe we ſhall find the catalogue of Iriſh reſident peers, reduced to a very contracted liſt indeed. I ſuppoſe the number of Commoners required or allowed to Iriſh repreſentation, in caſe of an Union, might be ſixty or ſeventy: it muſt be admitted to me, that theſe ſixty or ſeventy, would probably be from the moſt wealthy and reſpectable claſs of Iriſh gentry, and they alſo would be forced to become abſentees. Then calculate the number of individuals, (the neceſſary ſatellites on each of theſe moving political planets), you will find, that including wives, children, tutors, ſervants, &c. &c. the proportion of twenty-five dependents on each member of parliament, annually EXPORTED, would be no very unreaſonable ſuppoſition. Then calculate the probable amount of ſpecie which muſt be tranſmitted annually (from rack-rents, and Lord knows what elſe), to London, for the maintenance of each of theſe eighty or ninety exported Lords and Commoners, and alſo for

the maintenance of each of the twenty-five dependents attendant upon the said eighty or ninety members, and you will then see the enormous drawback of rank, consequence, and property, which would (of course) take place; nay—Vanity and Fashion would still further thin this desolated metropolis, and where would be the amends? Why, in the very cheap rate at which the thousands of troops necessary (in that event) to keep this city in order, would be accommodated with barracks; our splendid Parliament House would set, perhaps, at twenty shillings PER COLUMN, per annum; and that enchanting model of architectural beauty, the envy and the admiration of strangers, would hereafter be viewed but as the sad and sullen mausoleum, in which the Irish parliament would have interred the peace, the honor, the dignity, and the independence of the LATE IRISH NATION.

But to return to your pamphlet. You lament, (page 12), that the Irish parliament is *(now)* supposed under British influence, and you allow that (even now) near one million of the rents of this kingdom are annually exported to absentees. Permit me to ask, would your proposed Union lessen or ameliorate

ameliorate theſe cauſes of complaint? If three hundred of the firſt men in this kingdom, ſitting in College-green in Dublin, muſt be ſuppoſed under Britiſh influence, what muſt we conclude would be the caſe with ſixty of thoſe *very* perſons, when tranſplanted to St. Stephen's chapel, in London? Good God! Sir! Are you not arguing FOR ME by anticipation, or have you miſtaken the ſide of the water at which you ſhould have publiſhed your arguments? To my intellects, you are forcibly proving to the Engliſh nation, how much more cheaply they *might* govern the Iriſh people, than they do at preſent. You write as an Engliſhman to Engliſhmen, I write, and ſpeak, and FEEL as an Iriſhman, and I call on Iriſhmen to hear me!

As to the 14th page, about the Scotch and the Pretender, I can diſpatch it in a trice——

TEMPORA MUTANTUR, & NOS MUTAMUR IN ILLIS.

There can be little danger upon that head now; and as to any ſuppoſed or aſſumed ſimilarity between the ſtate of Scotland, in the reign of Queen Anne, and the preſent circumſtances of this kingdom, (vide page 15), that argument has already

been anticipated, and neatly and judiciously refuted by Mr. Spencer, in his elegant little work, "*Thoughts on a Union.*" A period of ninety-one years has not paſſed over the nations of Europe, without bringing in its train ſuch advantages of every kind, and ſuch increaſe of property and population, as have greatly altered the circumſtances of men and things, in the two countries: Nor can I think, Sir, that you have been a jot more happy in your AMERICAN parallel, with which you proceed to fill the three or four next pages, than you were in your Sabine compariſon, or your equally fortunate alluſions to the Netherlands, and to the Ciſalpine and Tranſalpine Republics. American conſolidation can furniſh no fair or juſt parallel to the caſe before us: Ireland and England are two ſeparate KINGDOMS; the States of America were thirteen diſtinct REPUBLICS; the American Union was a federal one, the Union you propoſe for Ireland is, (if I underſtand it right) an incorporated, NOT a federal Union. Beſides, no *natural* boundaries ever ſeperated the States of America; *their* ſeveral frontiers were in all parts arbitrary and artificial, and in ſome, imaginary.

We

We come now to that part of the work, (page 19) in which our Author enters on a relative calculation of the quantity of property in Ireland, and the different religions of its preſent poſſeſſors: and ſtates the number of Roman Catholic inhabitants of this kingdom to be, to the Proteſtants, in the proportion of four to one: while the property of the latter is eſtimated to exceed that of the former by the groſs amount of ten to one. Let us examine this ſtatement: It is a point of infinite magnitude, and I much fear that a miſtaken confidence on this very ſubject has been one of the cauſes, (and perhaps not one of the leaſt momentous) that produced thoſe claims and troubles, which have ſo lately agitated Ireland. I know it has been but too frequently aſſerted, that the Catholics of this country are in round numbers three fourths of its inhabitants; yet I hope to PROVE, before I diſmiſs this poſition, that ſuch a ratio neither is, or can be true.

In the year 1731, a ſurvey of this kingdom was had, and a very accurate CENSUS of its inhabitants taken, diſtinguiſhing the relative proportion of Catholic and Proteſtant occupiers in each diſtrict, in each county, and finally in each province. This work

work was executed by order of government, publiſhed the following year, 1732; and the faith of the government of the country pledged to its veracity. The proportion of Catholics to Proteſtants was therein ſtated, and aſcertained by documents which could not be refuted, to be on the ſcale of the whole kingdom as two and an half and a fraction to one, or in round numbers as five to two. Now if ſixty ſeven years ago, when the power of the Pope was ſurely higher than at preſent, and when Ireland had not received the addition of the numbers of Engliſh Proteſtant ſettlers, traders and adventurers, who, with their families, have ſince come over amongſt us; I ſay, if at that period, ſuch was the proportion of the two religions, it is now fair reaſoning to conclude that the exceſs, inſtead of encreaſing, has been diminiſhed. During the whole of this period, the proteſtant has been pretty generally the perſuaſion of the higher ranks of ſociety; of courſe, it became ſo of thoſe whom their patronage biaſſed, or their charity ſupported: beſides, the Catholic, until very lately, laboured under ſuch perſonal diſabilities, that he could not breed up his ſon to any of the learned profeſſions; and the alluring proſpect of glory and of rank by arms, ſo attractive to enthuſiaſtic minds, was to his view cloſed for ever:

ever: nay, he could not acquire, at leaſt he could not retain, and tranſmit to his poſterity, being Catholics, ANY REAL PROPERTY. Now, I aſk any man, who can keep his reaſon unclouded, and his opinions unprejudiced, is it preſumeable, is it reaſonable, or natural to conclude, that the coincidence of two ſuch powerful principles could have continued upwards of half a century unconſequential and inoperative? I make no account of proſelyteiſm, or open recantations upon either ſide; I am writing on no religious controverſy: God forbid! I reſpect, I honour, and I love ALL good men of ALL perſuaſions: yet I will venture to hazard the aſſertion, that Faſhion has ſome influence, even on religion; and that Self-intereſt has more: the ſtrict Catholic perſuaſion was rather going out of faſhion of late days, until religion became, unhappily, the handmaid of politics, and until ſome very deep men, ſome very ingenious, and ſome very able men contrived to make even the prejudices of the moſt oppoſite tenets, auxiliary to the ſchemes of private ambition and of perſonal aggrandizement. He has read the hiſtory of his own times with ſtrange inaccuracy, who can be ignorant of this; and he has conſidered the human heart ſuperficially indeed, who can deny it.

If

If then, it be conceded to me, that I have deduced my calculation from pure, and undeniable *facts*; I muſt take leave to alter your proportion of the two religions, from one fourth into two fifths; and from the ſame reaſons I have mentioned before, I muſt uſe a ſimilar liberty ſtill further to reduce your aſſertion, that the Proteſtant tenures at this day, are nine tenths of the whole property of Ireland. The Iriſh Catholic, at this day, can acquire, can enjoy, and can tranſmit REAL Property. The induſtry, the abilities, the good fortune, and the good ſenſe, of numbers of that perſuaſion, have enabled them to make large fortunes; they have ſeen their intereſts, uſed their ability, and purchaſed land. But taking the caſe upon your own ſhewing, and ſuppoſing the Proteſtant occupiers to hold nine tenths of all the lands in the kingdom, would it mend the matter to ſend many, or any of thoſe very landlords off their own eſtates, to ſerve in a Britiſh or United Parliament; and to expend the rents and produce of thoſe very eſtates, in the neceſſaries, the manufactures, the arts, and the luxuries, not of their own tenantry, or of their own country, but of another people in another kingdom? Would it ſerve to tranquillize the mind, would it conciliate the attachment of the Catholic tenant,

tenant, who now has his landlord on the ſpot, witneſs to his loſſes, and willing to relieve him; would it ſerve *him*, think you, to ſend a griping *Steward* to his farm, and have his laſt guinea eviſcerated from him, to be changed, perhaps, that hour into an Engliſh Bill; not *here* to be beſtowed in the relief of want, encouragement of arts, or even the conſumption of luxuries; but, *there* to be eaten at a feaſt, drank with a miſtreſs, or loſt upon a die!!!

Sir, this is, believe me, no highly coloured picture of the effects to be expected from an Union: ONE AND INDIVISIBLE.

In the following paragraphs of your work, you repreſent the conſequences which you ſay muſt reſult from the free admiſſion of the Catholics to complete political equality, and which you ſtate to be, Repeal of the Teſt and Supremacy Acts—Re-introduction of the Pope's Juriſdiction, &c. &c.: ſurely I ſhall not be expected to ſtop to debate ſuch improbable events. I incline to think the prime cauſe neceſſary to their production, will never have exiſtence. Let us not waſte time upon *poſſible* matters, or loſe ſight, even for a moment of the grand queſtion, UNION OR

no Union! Would to God, we could class that attempt amongst RASHER'S contingencies!

But to come, at length, to compleat argumentative precision:

In page 26 of your book, Sir, you regularly reduce and condense "the natural effects of a favourable legislative Union," into heads, and you dress these heads very much in the form of axioms, "First, secondly, thirdly, fourthly." I shall discuss them EVERY ONE: and before I begin, shall just make one general observation; namely, that by the expression "favourable legislative Union," you are "BEGGING THE QUESTION." What right have we to pre-suppose England would persevere in cramming "a favourable Union" down our throats; and insist on *leading* Ireland, her dear Sister, "*nolens, volens*," with Privileges, Rights, Exemptions, Immunities, and Advantages, of all kinds; which, if not taken and subtracted from her proper SELF, must drop from the moon? Will she say to Ireland, "Take HALF my trade, but I will keep ALL my taxes." Thus was she "monstrous kind," when she ALLURED us to a

SIMPLE

SIMPLE REPEAL, then WHEEDLED us to take her absolute RENUNCIATION; and at last COAXED us to accept of a FREE TRADE. Trust me, I should be sincerely sorry, cautious, and suspicious, were I now to see her COMPLIMENTING us with your "favourable Union." If ever England, by her engines, by her arts, or by her arms, shall be able to tempt, to bribe, or to provoke us to this SELF-DESTRUCTION of the vital principle of our POLITICAL EXISTENCE, if ever she shall be able to force, or to persuade us to commit upon ourselves, this great CONSTITUTIONAL SUICIDE, the only posthumous favour we can hope from the judgment of posterity, will be, — see — their fearful verdict — NATIONAL LUNACY!

But let me not wander from my original: you lay it down as granted, that "the natural effects," which would result from your "favourable Union," must be these;

First, "The Empire would have but one legislature, one organ of the public will, and the dangers which arise from an *Imperium in imperio*, from two supreme powers, would be avoided." Constitutionally speaking, I hold the Lords and Commons of Ire-

land to be but parts of an "*imperium*," and no "*Supreme power*," without the King: their Acts are powerleſs without the King. The King of England is "*ipſe facto*," King of Ireland; and until it is ſhewn to me, that the King of Ireland is ſubordinate to, controulable by, or dependant upon the King of England, I cannot bring myſelf to think, that the legiſlature of Ireland, as at preſent eſtabliſhed, is a "Supreme power," included in, ſubordinate to, controulable by, and dependent upon any other "Supreme power" under Heaven.

At the time I ſat down to anſwer your arguments, it was moſt devoutly my intention, not to deſiſt, until I ſhould have traced you, Sir, through all the paradoxes of your ingenious work, even to the laſt tittle of your laſt page; but, on throwing my eye over the ſcattered ſheets, which already lie written on my table, and conſidering I have not yet got farther on my journey, than to your 26th page, I am apprehenſive I ſhould exceed, in point of bulk, the limits uſually preſcribed to pamphlets of this nature: for the preſent, therefore, I am conſtrained, indeed reluctantly, to take my leave. What I have yet further to obſerve upon the ſubject, ſhall make the matter of a ſecond letter; and

as

as my heart is in the cauſe, you may conjecture that I ſhall not long continue, Sir, in your debt. In a very few days you ſhall hear from me again; and, if in what I have hitherto written, an expreſſion, or a word have eſcaped me, to give you perſonal pain or offence, I beg you to believe it very far from my intention.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your very humble, and

*No. 80, Marlborough-ſtreet,* Obedient Servant,

*2nd December, 1798.* PEMBERTON RUDD.

POSTSCRIPT.

# POSTSCRIPT.

I cannot be prevailed on to let this go to the Preſs, without, (though it is travelling beyond the regular order I had preſcribed to myſelf,) without giving you ſome ſhort hint of my ſentiments and feelings, when I read your very unkind and unmerited aſperſions, on thoſe glorious and patriotic characters, (the founders, in fact, of the Iriſh conſtitution, as the YEOMANRY ſince have been its Saviours,) I mean the original Volunteers of 1779 and 1782. That it may not be thought that I could miſtake, miſ-ſtate, or miſ-repreſent your true meaning, I tranſcribe the whole paſſage. It is in the 48th page of your work, where ſpeaking on the peculiar

liar aptitude of a ſeaſon, (ſuch as this) of irritation and of turbulence, as beſt ſuited to the introduction of conſtitutional innovations, becauſe readieſt offering the means to rivet them upon us; you deliver your opinion in theſe explicit and *extraordinary* terms:—

"As to a time of war, it is true, that the Volunteers took advantage of the embarraſſments "of Great Britain, in the laſt war, to aſſert the "independence of our parliament. It is likewiſe "true, that the United Iriſhmen, in the preſent "war, have taken advantage of the ſuppoſed "weakneſs of Great Britain, to play the game of "ſeparation. When, therefore, enemies of the "Empire take advantage of a time of war and "embarraſſment, to effect its ruin, we ſhould turn "againſt them their own game, and make uſe of "a time of war to eſtabliſh its ſecurity."

Here is a propoſition moſt logically conſtructed with two premiſes and a concluſion. Premiſes how incongruous! how monſtrous the concluſion! The original Volunteers of Ireland are here made to correſpond and agree, and are put in moſt pointed

pointed apposition to the horde of convicted, or confessed traitors, the United Irishmen of 1798: their actions are described in terms as injurious as any Johnson or Sheridan could furnish; "*to take advantage*," is appropriate to swindlers and robbers; "*to assert*," as it is here used, infers unjust assumption, and insinuates unfounded claim. The second sentence, designates the United Irishmen by precisely the same expression bestowed upon the Volunteers. "*The United Irishmen in the present war—the Volunteers in the last war*"—both *have taken advantage*. It is an unlucky phrase, and little mended by occurring yet a third time in the conclusion. "*Given, therefore, enemies of the empire take advantage*," &c. Enemies of the empire! Who? What enemies? And of what empire? Is it the original Volunteers of Ireland, enemies! Is it those very men to whom you yourself, then an Officer of the House of Commons, did in the Session of 1782, transmit, at least, TRANSMIT, the unanimous thanks of the Parliament of Ireland, for being the steady Friends and Soldiers of their country—The glorious founders of our Independency and Constitution! Are these

the enemies you mean? Are those the men you now say were "*effecting the ruin*" of their country? Are these the "*gamesters*," against whom you propose "*we should turn*" and unite? Who is meant by WE? Who *can* be meant? Not the United Irishmen: they are also players of the same game you say: not the corporate bodies of Ireland: not the Houses of Parliament of Ireland: they have all recorded their sentiments, their approbation, and their thanks: not the Merchants of Ireland, they enjoy that very "Free Trade" the Volunteers procured them: not the Lawyers of Ireland, they know their constitution, and they love it; and when they entered the profession, Sir, they swore to SUPPORT it: not the Yeomanry of Ireland, they armed to protect, secure, and improve, what the Volunteers armed to assert, establish, and maintain. There is not then, (and I am proud to say it!) there is not then in ALL Ireland, one single rank, class, or description of men, to whom your *patriotic* exhortation is, or can be applicable. As you have chosen *English* arguments, you must select an *English* audience, and you are sure of pleasing. As to us, leave us, for God's sake, as you found us: We have been in a fever, the crisis is past, and we are

 mending;

mending; do not *bleed* or *phyſic* us into a *conſumption*, and all may be well yet. Our *Conſtitution* is not *ſo* bad as *you* would make it.

In my next, (for poſitively I am juſt concluding,) you ſhall have the thoughts of an unambitious man, upon that part of your pamphlet, in which you exult, not a little, at the wholeſome curb and reſtrictive effect of an Union; in detaching young barriſters from political purſuits: chaining them like *clerks* and ſcriveners to their deſks, and putting an effectual ſtop to thoſe *impudent* ſtrides by which they are ſo apt to *thruſt* themſelves into the Houſe of Commons: not forgetting to ſuggeſt to you one trifling omiſſion which you made in your catalogue of advantages, that are to accrue to ſuitors, after an Union, in having their cauſes argued and managed by lawyers, who will, *then*, no longer have their brains bewildered with political ſpeculations: but you ſtrangely forgot to mention the great additional advantage which the ſaid ſuitors muſt derive from the RE-TRANSPORTATION of the APPELLANT JURISDICTION: whereby they will have their cauſes *finally* decided on, in a much ſhorter, quicker, eaſier, and leſs expenſive manner,

no

no doubt, at the Bar of the Britiſh Houſe of Lords, than they could poſſibly have at home here in the capital of their own county: Not to mention its being a fooliſh, gaudy feather in the cap of the Iriſh Conſtitution, with which we dreſſed ourſelves ſo giddily in 1781. I think I remember an illumination when the Appellant Juriſdiction was brought home to us: it will be perfectly in character to illuminate again, when it ſhall be taken away, away for EVER, by the conſummation of an Iriſh Union, one and indiviſible!

P. R.

FINIS.

6 DE 58